29th January 1923]

(c) who were the persons responsible for this accident; and what action Government have taken in the matter; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to lay the whole file on the table?

A.—(a) An accident occurred at the place referred to, on the 12th November 1922.

(b) The accident was due to a breach in the line caused by the bursting of tanks situated near the Railway. Four passengers and two firemen were killed and three passengers injured. A list of damage to permanent way, stock, etc., is annexed.*

(c) The accident was due to causes beyond control, namely, to a flood caused by the bursting of tank bunds. The enquiries made did not show that a charge of omission or neglect lay against any member of the Railway staff and no further action was called for.

(d) There is no other information which can be placed on the table.

Irrigation facilities from Kottapalli channel, Cuddapah district.

682 Q.—Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(1) whether any estimate has been prepared for the repair or diversion of the Kottapalli channel, irrigating lands in the villages of Moadamidipalli and Kottapalli near Proddatur town, Proddatur taluk;

(2) whether the Collector demanded half the cost of the estimate to be borne by the ryots;

(3) whether the spring head of this channel is completely silted up;

(4) what is the extent of land irrigated by this channel and whether it is classed as dry or wet;

(5) whether any of the lands are now cultivated with wet crops; and

(6) whether the Government are collecting or attempting to collect wet assessment for dry crops?

A.—(1) to (5) The Government have no information.

(6) When dry crops are raised on wet lands the usual wet assessment is levied except in cases where the remission rules apply.

Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu:—"With reference to answer to paragraphs (1) to (5), will the Government be pleased to call for the information as it affects a large number of ryots?"

The hon. Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar:—"Yes."

Irrigation facilities of the Pallavanar river, Tanjore.

683 Q.—Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai: Will the hon. the Law Member and the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(i) whether it is a fact that Pallavanar as stated in the present Tanjore resettlement scheme report, pages 41 and 42, was classified as a second-class

* Vide Appendix B on page 1289 infra.

[29th January 1923

water-source, and was intended to irrigate a block of wet land area of three miles and then to fall into the main river Vennar further down where it is called Pottayar;

(ii) whether it is a fact that the same Pallavanar is in fact not irrigable in the abovementioned area or able to discharge itself in the Pottayar as originally intended;

(iii) whether it is a fact that the exercise of the rights granted to certain ryots to place a mud dam across the Pottayar just above its junction with Pallavanar is causing serious handicap in that the supply of water is late, scanty and precarious in villages depending on the lower reaches of these water-sources during the cultivation season, i.e., ploughing and planting seasons;

(iv) whether it is a fact that the landowners of the affected area repeatedly petitioned the Government authorities for redress since the last settlement without any effect; and

(v) what are the soil tarams of this affected area before and after the present settlement scheme and what relief the Government intend giving to the pattadars of the area for the loss already sustained and future loss they may incur?

A.—The Pallavanar taking off from the Vellayar joins the Vennar after a course of 3 miles which length is known as the first reach. The combined course from this junction down to the infall into the Harischandranadhi is known as the second and third reaches of the Pallavanar. In the first reach there is no difficulty in irrigation. Just above the head of the combined course, a mud dam is raised across the Vennar by the Pudur ryots. The combined course was formerly receiving water from the Vellayar through the Pallavanar first reach, but as the bed of the Vennar is now higher than that of the Pallavanar first reach, the Vellayar water cannot freely enter into the combined course. The Vennar below the Annamarasanar infall is not also wide enough to carry the supply required for the reaches below the mud dam. It has accordingly been proposed that the quantity of water that the Vellayar should carry for the lower reaches of the Pallavanar should be diverted down the Vennar at the Vennar-Vellayar head, and for this purpose it is proposed to improve and widen the Vennar from the Annamarasanar infall down to the Pudur mud dam, to convert the latter into a masonry regulator and to provide regulating arrangements to all the sluices in the Vennar down to the Pudur mud dam. Estimates aggregating Rs. 31,300 for the works have accordingly been sanctioned in July 1921.

The Pallavanar is now treated as a second-class source. But the Special Settlement Officer has been given powers to revise the line of division between second and third class sources with a view to give relief to the unfavourably situated second-class villages by transferring the irrigation sources in these villages to the third class.

The Government have no information regarding the soil tarams referred to.